

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

020 N STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 P.O. BOX 1799, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95808)

(916) 445-1516

February 4, 1983

CONWAY H. COLLIS
First District, Los Angeles
ERNEST J DRONENBURG, JR
Second District, San Diego
WILLIAM M. BENNETT
Third District, Kentfield

RICHARD NEVINS Fourth District, Pasadena KENNETH CORY Controller, Sacramento

DOUGLAS D. BELL Executive Secretary
No. 83/12

TO COUNTY ASSESSORS:

ARTICLE XIII A INFLATION FACTOR

This letter is to alert you to the fact that based on the April 1982 to December 1982 data the annual inflation factor will fall below the two (2) percent for the first time since the voters approved Proposition 13. This may present program problems to some of you.

Section 2(b) of Article XIII A states in part:

"The full cash value base may reflect from year to year the inflationary rate not to exceed 2 percent for any given year or reduction as shown in the consumer price index. . . ."

Section 51 of the Revenue and Taxation Code interprets this as follows:

"For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, for each lien date after the lien date in which the base year value is determined pursuant to Section 110.1, the taxable value of real property shall be the lesser of:

"(a) Its base year value, compounded annually since the base year by an inflation factor, which shall be the percentage change in the cost of living, as defined in Section 2212; provided, that any increase shall not exceed 2 percent of the prior year's value; or. . . "

Section 2212 of the Revenue and Taxation Code provides:

"'Percentage change in cost of living' means the percentage change from April 1 of the prior year to April 1 of the current year in the California Consumer Price Index for all items, as determined by the California Department of Industrial Relations."

This legal mandate has been with us since the voters adopted Proposition 13 in 1978. Until now, however, the only effect has been to hold down the inflation factor applicable to base year values to 2 percent for each of the years since 1975. Because the CCPI (California Consumer Price Index) has been so much in excess of the 2 percent limitation, little attention has been paid to it. It appears that 1983 may prove to be the year that the CCPI factor will fall short of the 2 percent limiting amount and will, in all probability, be negative. The April 1982 to December 1982 factor is a negative .7 percent (-.7%) with several months still to be compiled to arrive at a final computation.

To better understand this factor, one must first understand the CCPI. This Consumer Price Index is a measure of the cost of goods relative to costs in 1967. The enclosed table reports the results for the last 24 months. The April 1982 CCPI of 293.0 means that a market basket of goods in 1967 costing \$10 cost \$29.30 in April 1982. Further, the April 1982 figure of 293.0 is 8.7 percent over the April 1981 figure of 269.6 (293.0 ± 269.6 = 1.0868 or up 8.7%).

There are separate indices for Los Angeles (compiled monthly), San Francisco-Oakland (compiled bimonthly starting with February), San Diego (compiled bimonthly starting with January), and a statewide composite compiled bimonthly starting in February. There is no April 1 index; however, there is a statewide compilation for the month of April. This may cause one to wonder if the April index is to be used or some other time frame. The State Controller had the same problem in implementing Section 16113(e) of the Government Code in that the April 1 to April 1 factor (Section 2212, Revenue and Taxation Code) was used to compute the business inventories and sportfishing boat subventions. In that calculation, the Controller elected to use April 1981 and April 1982 data for the comparison.

Using April 1982 as a base, we can compute from the enclosed the percent change for various points in time over this past year, i.e.:

April 1982 to June 1982 = $298.0 \div 293.0 = 1.0171$ or up 1.7%

April 1982 to August 1982 = $297.5 \div 293.0 = 1.0154$ or up 1.5%

April 1982 to October 1982 = $296.4 \div 293.0 = 1.0116$ or up 1.2%

April 1982 to December $1982 = 291.0 \div 293.0 = .9932$ or down .7%

These indices are computed by the California State Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research from indices issued by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. They are published bimonthly with the last one (December 1982) being received on January 27, 1983. We anticipate the April report to be available after May 25, 1983.

We will keep you posted as to the results of both the February and April reports as soon as they are available to us. Any questions should be directed to me or to Robert H. Gustafson, Chief of Operations.

Sincerely,

Gordon P. Adelman
Assistant Executive Secretary
Department of Property Taxes

GPA:sfg
Enclosure

DIVISION OF LABOR STATISTICS AND RESEARCH P.O. Box 603, San Francisco, Calif. 94101

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX—CALIFORNIA

3 * CEIVED

Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, San Francisco-Oakland, and San Diego United States City Average, 1981 - 82

CAN 3 7 (983 Chatistical Research &

iting Division

and of Equalization

All Items 1967 = 100

	Year and month		All Urban Consumers					Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers b				
		California ⁸	Los Angeles- Long Beach- Anaheim ^C	San Francisco-Oakkand ^C	San Diego ^c	U.S. City average	California ³	Los Antjeles Long Beach- Ansheim ^C	San Francisco-Oakland C	San Diego ^c	U.S. City average	
1001.	Tourse		259.4		287 7	260 5	-	262.7	_	282.9	260.7	
1981:	January Estaman	264.2	261.6	260 5	-	263 2	265 8	265 0	261.6	-	263.5	
	February March	4)% _	263 3	200 3	293 1	265 1		266 5	-	288 0	265.3 265.2	
	4 19	260.6	265 5	270 3	-	266 8	271 2	269 1	270 9		066.0	
	April	269 6	267 3		297 5	269 0	2/12	270 7		202.5	266.8	
	May	272 6	267 9	274 0		2713	274 <i>2</i>	270 7	-	292 5	269.1	
	June	2/20	2019	2140	•	2/13	2142	2/1./	274 3	•	271 4	
	July		272 2	•	305 4	274 4		276 3	-	300.5	274 6	
	Augurt	281.4	274 8	287 9		276 5	282 7	278 6	287 2	-	276.5	
	September	-	279 3		313 9	279 3		282 9	•	308 0	279 1	
	October	288.6	281 3	297 0	-	279 9	289 5	284 9	295 6	-	279 7	
	November		281 6 ^r	-	321 3	280.7	-	285 Jr	-	3151	280.4	
	December	289.1°	282.1 ^r	294 0	•	281 5	290 0°	285 9 ^r	292 7	•	281 1	
	Annual		•									
	average	276.6	271 4	279 0	304 6	272 4	277 9	275 0	278 8	299.3	272.3	
1982:	January		285 6 ^r		323 1	282 5		289 6 ^r		317 4	282 1	
	February	291.9 ^r	285.4°	295 B	-	283 4	293 0 ^r	289 2 ^r	294 9	-	282 9	
	March	•	286 4 ^r	•	319 0	283 1	-	290 2 ^r	-	3139	<i>2</i> 82 5	
	April	293 O ^r	286 6 ^t	298 8		284 3	294 2 ^r	290 3°	297 8	-	283 7	
	May	-	287 1	-	329 2	287 1	-	290 6	-	323 3	286.5	
	june	298.0	290.1	304 6	•	290 6	299 0	293 9	303 4	• .	290.1	
	July	-	289.3	-	334 8	292 2		293 0		329.4	291 8	
	August	297.5	289 1	304 3		292 8	298 3	292 8	302 8		292.4	
	September	-	288 2		325 ti	293 3		291 7	•	321 1	292 8	
	October	296 4	289.5	302 4		294 1	297 3	292 8	301 3		293 6	
	November	-	288 5	•	321 7	293 6	-	291 6		318 2	293.2	
	December	291 0	285 3	293.9	-	292 4	291 7	288.0	293 6	•	292 0	
	Annusi											
		n.a.	287.6	300 0	n.a	289 1	n a	291.1	298 9	n a	288 6	
	Average	1					l					

^{*}Weighted average of the consumer price indexes for Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, San Francisco-Oakland, and San Diego Computed by the Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research from indexes issued by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Revised 12/21/82. The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, has issued revised CPI figures for Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim which necessitated revision of the California CPI for December 1981, February and April 1982. Further information on the revisions, which were due to corrections in several pricing quotes over the year, may be obtained from the BLS Regional Office.

n.a. Not avdilable.

Source U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

January 21, 1983

bRevised index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers.

c1970 Census of Population metropolitan area definitions. Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, is an aggregation of two SMSA's